

Dear Dr. Zhang,

We are pleased to inform you that, after preview by the Editorial Office and peer review as well as CrossCheck and Google plagiarism detection, we believe that the academic quality, language quality, and ethics of your Manuscript NO.: 54574 basically meet the publishing requirements of the World Journal of Clinical Cases. As such, we have made the preliminary decision that it is acceptable for publication after your appropriate revision. Upon our receipt of your revised manuscript, we will send it for re-review. We will then make a final decision on whether to accept the manuscript or not based on the reviewers' comments, the quality of the revised manuscript, and the relevant documents.

In order for you to publish a high-quality academic article in the World Journal of Clinical Cases, lead the development of the discipline, and attract more readers, the first author and corresponding author are requested to follow the steps outlined below to revise your manuscript to meet the requirements for final acceptance and publication. **Please note that you have only two chances for revising the manuscript.**

Step 1: Please select revise this manuscript or not

Step 2: Key points of revising the manuscript

(1) *Scientific quality:* Please resolve all issues in the manuscript based on the peer review report and make a point-to-point response to the issues raised in the peer review report.

(2) *Language quality:* Please resolve all language issues in the manuscript based on the peer review report. Please be sure to have a native-English speaker edit the manuscript for grammar, sentence structure, word usage, spelling, capitalization, punctuation, format, and general readability, so that the manuscript's language will meet our direct publishing needs.

(3) *Special requirements for figures:* Figures must be presented in the order that they appear in the main text of the manuscript (numbered as 1, 2, 3, *etc.*). The requirements for the figures and figure legends include: (A) All submitted figures, including the text contained within the figures, must be editable. Please provide the text in your figure(s) in text boxes; (B) For line drawings that were automatically generated with software, please provide the labels/values of the ordinate and abscissa in text boxes; (C) Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor; and (D) In consideration of color-blind readers, please avoid using red and green for contrast in vector graphics or images.

(4) *Special requirements for tables:* Tables must be presented in the order that they appear in the main text of the manuscript (numbered as 1, 2, 3, *etc.*). Please

verify that the tables are referred to in the text by their respective Roman numerals and that the numbering order is correct and format the tables. Please verify that there are no missing or multiple spaces in the text and tables, *e.g.* before or after parentheses, between words, or before or after symbols like +, ×, ±, <, >, ≥, and ≤. Please verify that the special words or letters in the text and tables are correct, *e.g.* *P* (uppercase), *n* (lowercase), *via*, *vs* (lowercase, no punctuation), *in vivo*, *in vitro*, and *et al* (no punctuation) are italicized.

(5) *Special requirements for references:* Please provide the PubMed numbers and DOI citation numbers to the reference list and list all authors of the references. Please revise throughout. The author should provide the first page of the paper without PMID and DOI numbers. NOTE: The PMID is required, and NOT the PMCID; the PMID number can be found at <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov>. (Please begin with PMID:) The DOI number can be found at <http://www.crossref.org/SimpleTextQuery/>. (Please begin with DOI: 10.**).

Please verify that the references are cited by Arabic numerals in square brackets and superscripted in the text, and that the numbering order is correct. There should be no space between the bracket and the preceding word or the following punctuation. When references in the text and tables are cited with author name(s), it is necessary to manually verify that the name(s) is consistent with the first author's surname in the corresponding reference list.

(6) *Special requirements for article highlights:* If your manuscript is an original study (basic study or clinical study), meta-analysis, systemic review, the “article highlights” section should be provided. Detailed writing requirements for “article highlights” can be found in the Guidelines and Requirements for Manuscript Revision.

Step 3: Manuscript revision deadline

We request that you submit your revision in no more than **14 days**.

Step 4: Verify the accuracy of general information for your manuscript

Step 5: Peer-review report(s)

The authors must resolve all issues in the manuscript based on peer-review report(s) and make a point-to point response to the issues raised in the peer-review report(s) which listed below:

Point-by-Point Response to Reviewers' Comments

Our point-by-point responses to the reviewers' comments are outlined below in blue text.

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: Informative article. Objectives needs to be clarified as primary and secondary...Elaborate on sample size. Discussion needs to be focused.

Response: Thank you for your comments. In the last paragraph of the *Patient assessment* subsection of our MATERIALS AND METHODS section, we mentioned the primary and secondary objectives as follows, "The main observation index was the improvement rate of different symptoms in patients with non-neurogenic, non-obstructive dysuria (baseline vs. test period vs. the latest follow-up). Furthermore, the secondary observations were the improvement rate of QoL and the incidence of complications." Please review and confirm that this clarifies our objectives.

With regard to the sample size of this study, a total of 96 patients with non-neurogenic, non-obstructive dysuria diagnosed in 10 medical centers in China from January 2012 to December 2016 were initially considered for inclusion in our study. Among them, 35 patients chose to receive other treatment, 7 patients did not meet the input and excretion criteria, all were excluded; finally, 54 patients who met the criteria were included in the present study.

The discussion section has also been revised for improved clarity.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: According to my view the manuscript is adequately written.

Response: Thank you for your work on this manuscript. We appreciate your positive review.

Step 6: Editorial Office's comments

The author must revise the manuscript according to the Editorial Office's comments and suggestions, which listed below:

(1) *Science Editor:*

1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes a retrospective study of clinical outcomes of sacral neuromodulation in non-neurogenic, non-obstructive dysuria. The topic is within the scope of the WJCC. (1) Classification: Grade C and Grade C; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: The reviewer #00735356 thinks the article is informative but objectives need to be clarified as primary and secondary. Elaborate on sample size and discussion needs to be focused. The reviewer #00503175 thinks the manuscript is adequately written. (3) Format: There are 3 tables and 1 figure. A total of 16 references are cited, including 2 references published in the last 3 years. There is 1 self-citation.

2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade B and Grade B. A language editing certificate issued by CACTUS was provided.

3 Academic norms and rules: The authors provided the Biostatistics Review Certificate and the Institutional Review Board Approval Form. The authors signed the Copyright License Agreement and the Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure Form. The authors did not provide the Signed Informed Consent Form. No academic misconduct was found in the CrossCheck detection and Bing search.

4 Supplementary comments: This is an unsolicited manuscript. The study was supported by the grant from National Key R&D Program of China. The topic has not previously been published in the WJCC.

5 Issues raised: (1) The authors did not provide the approved grant application form(s). Please upload the approved grant application form(s) or funding agency copy of any approval document(s); (2) The “Article Highlights” section is missing. Please add the “Article Highlights” section at the end of the main text.

6 Recommendation: Conditional acceptance. (Han Zhang)

Response: Thank you for your detailed feedback. We have made the appropriate revisions as required. Please review our changes and inform us if any further revisions are needed.

(2) Editorial Office Director: I have checked the comments written by the science editor. Re-Review: Not required.

Response: Thank you for your time on our manuscript.

(3) Company Editor-in-Chief: I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, the full text of the manuscript, the relevant ethics documents, and the English Language Certificate, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Clinical Cases, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office’s comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors.

Response: Thank you for your time on our manuscript.

Step 7: Revise the manuscript

We only accept the manuscript in MS Word format, and the manuscript in other formats will be rejected.